

**Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup
Draft Meeting Summary
September 8, 2005 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM
Colusa Farm Bureau
Colusa, CA**

**Summary prepared by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator, Common Ground: Center for
Cooperative Solutions with assistance from Ellen Gentry, Sacramento River
Conservation Area Forum**

Present:

**AW: Annalena Bronson, Burt Bundy, Greg Golet (alternate for Dawit Zeleke), Pat Kittle,
Joan Phillipe (alternate for John Rogers), Jeff Sutton, and Jon Wrysinski**

**Staff: Beverley Anderson-Abbs (SRCAF), Michelle Baker (Common Ground), Ellen
Gentry (SRCAF), Facilitator Carolyn Penny (Common Ground), Project Manager Gregg
Werner (TNC)**

Guests: Fran Borcalli, Butch Hodgkins

Agenda:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
1.	10:00	Carolyn Penny, Facilitator	Welcome, Introductions, August Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions. Approve agenda. Approve August summary.
2.	10:10	Gregg Werner, Hydraulic Analysis Subcommittee, All	Hydraulic Analysis Subcommittee Meeting and Scope of Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gain an update on the Hydraulic Analysis Subcommittee meeting and the upcoming process.
3.	10:40	Gregg Werner, Public Recreation Subcommittee, All	Public Recreation Subcommittee Meeting and Scope of Work/Consultant List	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gain an update on the Public Recreation Subcommittee meeting and the upcoming process.
4.	11:10	Gregg Werner, All	Other Scopes of Work/Consultant Lists	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and approve scopes of work for other AW-identified studies.
5.	12:00	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Receive comment.
6.	12:15	All	Lunch and Break	

Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup Draft Meeting Summary 9.8.05

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
7.	12:45	Gregg Werner, All	Timeline and Process for AW Involvement with Consultant Selection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarify process by which the studies move forward, including AW involvement in consultant selection.
8.	1:15	All	November 7 AW Meeting and Field Trip	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Determine sites and logistics for November 7 Aw meeting and field trip.
9.	1:40	Carolyn Penny, All	Next Agenda and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Shape next agenda; articulate interim steps.
10.	2:00	Carolyn Penny	Adjourn	

Note: With the group's agreement, agenda topics were taken out of order to maximize participation in the Hydraulic Analysis discussion.

Review of August Meeting Summary

The AW agreed to accept the August meeting summary as written unless changes were submitted to Carolyn by September 16.

Public Recreation Subcommittee Meeting and Scope of Work/Consultant List

The subgroup (Mike Fehling, Armand Gonzales, Joan Phillipe, Jay Dee Garr, Gregg Werner, and Greg Golet) met August 19. Two principle components were discussed: (1) a development plan for improving public access and recreation opportunities on public lands and (2) developing a master plan for the Colusa Subreach of the Sacramento River state recreation area extending into the Ward tract. Discussion included planning attention to boat ramp facilities, reorientation of facilities, the need for a general plan, and the history of the site (former city dump site.) (See handout C., Ward Tract Area.) The subgroup will report to the AW for the final scope of work.

Diagrams provided by Gregg highlighted the review process (see Public Access Plan and Ward/Colusa-Sacramento River SRA Master Plan). The process leads to a presentation to the AW by the Recreation subgroup on the final report. Greg Golet noted that the flow chart needs an additional box to indicate that the subgroup will review the study design. A title change was suggested to include, "...and Colusa Subreach Public Access Plan" so that the entire subreach is explicitly included. Scheduling was reviewed for the final report.

After Pat mentioned the need to build on work already done by California Department of Fish and Game and US Fish and Wildlife, Gregg noted that substantial sections from existing F&G and F&W plans would be used as applicable.

Jon asked if any part of the State Park is in the city limits. Joan responded that the State Park is close to, but not in, the city limits. It does have water and sewer service from the city of Colusa.

Burt noted the need to coordinate with the recreation element in the county's general plan. Pat asked whether there is any difficulty with state involvement with the Ward tract. Gregg noted that there is no problem with the state taking on the Ward property and that the habitat restoration plan will cover how the properties work together in terms of recreation, access, and habitat restoration.

Joan, Pat and Burt noted that there will likely be much public interest with a need to allow time for public input and to allow for early public input. Joan added that the Central Valley Vision Project through State Parks and Recreation is also asking for public input and the efforts should coordinate to avoid some duplication. Butch commented that additional outreaching to potentially affected private landowners is important. Gregg Werner assured that adjoining owners will be considered. Jon stated that Nancy Ward should be included in these conversations, especially in regard to access. Burt reminded the group that outreach principles (early, plenty of time, additional efforts with potentially affected landowners) need to be applied to the entire subreach.

Other Scopes of Work and Consultant Lists

Fiscal and Economic Effects

Local fiscal and economic effects of anticipated, future wildlife habitat acquisition and restoration projects within the Colusa Subreach were reviewed (see handout D, Analysis of the Local Fiscal and Economic Effects of Proposed Wildlife Habitat Conservation Projects in the Colusa Subreach). The change from the prior Scope of Work is the listing of the specific pieces of property. This analysis includes proposed conversion of land.

Jeff Sutton would like to see the analysis of offsetting benefits kept separate and with all assumptions spelled out. He asked about the mention of in lieu payments. Gregg answered that the analysis would give an overview of efforts to modify in lieu payments. Jeff will work with Gregg to provide some of that information. Jeff and Joan Phillippe volunteered to assist in interviewing consultants. Jeff wants to include Ben Carter as well.

Regulatory Limitations and Species

Greg Golet reported on the Analysis of Regulatory Limitations and Pest Species Effects on Agriculture Caused by Restoration. Changes from the earlier Scope of Work are the expansion of issues from the Endangered Species Act to a larger set of regulatory limitations and the listing of the specific properties. He is coordinating with the SRCAF Cross Boundary subcommittee and expects the consultant will as well. He reviewed the process diagram, and will continue to update the AW.

Jeff noted the need to look at the long-term horizon and to factor in the listing of more species as well as success in species recovery (de-listing.) Butch Hodgkins suggested that the AW include in the Scope of Work a comparison of property adjacent to habitat and property not

adjacent to habitat. Jeff Sutton recommended close coordination with Project Tracker information. Jon Wrysinski recommended consulting with county farm advisors and extension offices, especially regarding small mammal cycles. Beverley Anderson-Abbs/Burt Bundy, Francis Hickie/Ben Carter and Jeff Sutton were selected to assist Gregg and 1 additional TNC person in this area.

Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

Hydraulic Analysis

For the hydraulic modeling and analysis, the Workgroup selected Fran Borcalli, an engineer with Wood Rodgers, to provide a second opinion of the results of the analysis. He would be hired through UC Davis, and would then begin discussion with the hydraulic analysis subcommittee. Before he left for another meeting, Fran asked the AW for input regarding his role.

Jon Wrysinski mentioned that the AW wants to be as certain as it can regarding flood impacts. He added that the existing system, designed for a 25 year storm, is unsettling.

Jeff Sutton asked Fran to plan a role similar to the role he has played with the Glenn-Cordura situation. He stated the AW wants to have someone who speaks “engineer” to make sure the group is not overlooking anything and to offer input as if Fran lived in the area. Fran asked if the AW wants him to include identification of deficiencies of the existing flood control system. The group responded affirmatively. Pat Kittle offered contacts who know the river.

After Fran left, the AW examined the revised Scope of Work materials the timeline/flow chart. Gregg gave the overview.

Ayres will be doing the principal study. There is a need to resolve whether the two-dimensional model or three-dimensional model is best-suited for the greatest range and detail. The analysis will include thalweg (lowest point in the channel) comparison for a general indication of channel depth changes. Gregg mentioned that tasks 1 and 2 can be moved immediately following a contract; LIDAR data (task 3) will be available in January/February 2006 (see handout A. Hydraulic Analysis). Gregg also mentioned that the final Scope of Work will indicate the number of runs under Task 6.

Jeff asked if the model includes impacts on erosion points. Gregg responded that the Scope of Work can include analysis of the impacts of any velocity flow and flow direction changes resulting from restoration on the erosion sites. Jon Wrysinski asked if river meander is included. Gregg answered that river meander is not included in this analysis; this model assumes existing channel configuration. Gregg also stated he would talk with Tom and Fran to see if they can include some aspects of meander. Beverley Anderson-Abbs recommended contacting Eric Larsen from UCD regarding meander as it is not included in the two dimensional study.

Pat Kittle asked about woody debris since it was a significant topic of discussion at the public meeting. Gregg acknowledged that large woody debris needs to be addressed in the final report.

Jeff noted that the subcommittee will want input from Fran and Tom to make sure they are asking the right questions. Gregg agreed and suggested the process include at least 2 points along the way for that sort of check-in. Jeff also suggested that Gregg get Francis' input on the Hydraulic Analysis Scope of Work before the next subgroup meeting.

Butch noted that LIDAR data has an error of +/- a couple of feet, a difference that can be significant with the levee heights. He suggested the inclusion of survey profiles on top of the levees. He also suggested asking the contractor for LIDAR sampling regarding reliability. Butch noted that this analysis lacks an assessment of the condition of the levees and, thus, would be a useful but not complete assessment of the risk of flooding.

Greg Golet responded that there will be field verification of the LIDAR data. He noted that the margin of error with this contractor is +/- 4 inches.

Jon asked Butch what spacing he looks for in Sacramento between the flow and the top of the levee to have confidence in flood control. Butch responded that he is comfortable with 2 feet with sound levees. Where the levee failed is available in an assessment by the Corps of Engineers in the Comprehensive Study. The next subgroup meeting will be set for the end of the month to detail the scope of work.

Timeline and Process for Involvement of AW in Consultant Selection

The interviews of consultants for two projects are expected in early October in Colusa.

The interview team for Fiscal and Economic Impacts is Jeff, Joan, and Ben. The interview team for Regulatory/Pest Effects is Jeff (if he can make it), Ben or Francis, Burt or Beverly, Gregg, and 1 additional person from TNC.

Next meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for November 7, 10:00AM-4:00PM, beginning at the State Recreation Area. Recognizing the time it takes to load and unload at each site, the AW discussed possible field trip locations.

Gregg suggested that the morning could include the State Recreation Area and the Ward Property. For the afternoon, time allowing, the stops could be:

- a) 1000-acre and Stegeman
- b) Princeton south (4-5 years old) *eliminate if schedule too tight
- c) 10-year old restoration area across from Princeton
- d) Womble
- e) Jensen
- f) DFG restoration at Moulton North (site near Ben's)
- g) Boeger
- h) Cruise-n-Tarry (maybe delete, but DWR wants consideration as site)

Lunch will be included. Details will be provided prior to the fieldtrip.

The following meeting was scheduled for **December 5, 10:00AM-2:00PM**, at Colusa Farm Bureau. The focus will be the baseline analysis reports and updates. The baseline analysis reports will be distributed in advance of the meeting to allow AW members to read them before discussion.

February 6 is the possible date for the following AW meeting.

Other Next Steps

- Greg/Gregg will work with people who suggested changes to Scopes of Work
- 2004 atlas of erosion points – Gregg will send to the whole AW, including Beverley
- November 7 logistics – Ellen will communicate workshop logistics to AW
- Changes to August meeting summary – any changes to Carolyn by September 16; if none, then final